

app 12 55
destroyed

SAPC 3651
COPY 1 OF 2

THE PERKIN-ELMER CORPORATION



NORWALK • CONNECTICUT

TELEPHONE: VICTOR 7-2422 • CABLE ADDRESS: PECO-NORWALK

IN REPLY, PLEASE REFER TO:

January 23, 1956

25X1

[Redacted]
Contract Officer
United States Government
United States of America

Subject: 1) Flood damage to customer's equipment.
2) Repair of customer's equipment

Dear Sir:

The damage inflicted by the flood which struck our plant on October 15, 1955 has now been thoroughly assessed. Damage to your property in our plant was confined to two areas; the Image Evaluator, delivered July 9, 1955; and the prototype of the Computer and Memory Unit, delivered July 19, 1955.

In accordance with your instructions, we proceeded to make the necessary repairs so that our program would not be delayed. Our costs, for which we here request reimbursement, are as follows:

- 1) Image Evaluator: disassembly, cleaning, repair, and replacement of Scope, Wave Analyzer, Brush Recorder, reassembly and test

Engineering & Model Shop Labor	
168 hrs @ \$3.75	\$ 630. ✓
Engineering & Model Shop Overhead	
168 hrs @ \$3.50	588. ✓
Parts	<u>1,182.</u>
Total Prime Costs	\$2,400. ✓
Administration @ 10%	<u>240.</u> ✓
Reimbursement Requested	\$2,640. ✓ ✓

25X1

Item 18-a
CONTAINS SENSITIVE
COMPARMENTED INFORMATION

-2-

January 23, 1956

25X1

- 2) Prototype Memory Unit: Disassembly, cleaning, replacement of damaged parts, reassembly and retest.

Engineering & Model Shop Labor	
140 hrs @ \$3.75	\$ 525.
Engineering & Model Shop Overhead	
140 hrs @ \$3.50	490.
Parts	55.
Total Prime Costs	\$1,070.
Administration @ 10%	107.
Reimbursement Requested	\$1,177. ✓

Item 33-a

We do not feel that these expenditures should be included in our contract costs used to determine our final profit but rather that they should be handled by a separate purchase order. Therefore, we request that you issue a purchase order in the amount of \$3,817. to cover the above expenditures.

In addition to the above expenditures, we would like to report our flood losses under other portions of our program which will be borne by Perkin-Elmer and will not be billed to you.

Windows - Loss of 2 30" blanks	\$2,000.
Data Cameras, rework of exposure control test set up	185.
36" f/10 lens, clean up prototype	320.
Scanning periscopes, repair hand control parts, bearings, differential, optics, clean and re-assemble, including 400 hrs. labor and \$2,500 parts	5,000.
24" f/6 lenses, rework and reassemble lenses	320.
Optical test equipment, replace motors, rework and reassemble	1,300.
Total flood costs not billable.	\$9,125.

Since the above costs are being borne by Perkin-Elmer, we would like to have them recognized at the conclusion of the program should our actual costs exceed our target costs by this amount so that our profit will not be affected by a matter over which we had no control.

In addition to restoring our flood damages, we have also repaired the Hand Control Unit for Scanning Periscope #101, first delivered September 26, which was damaged while in normal use. Our costs for doing this work are as follows:

Joseph Harrison Welles

-2-

January 23, 1956

Engineering 16 hrs @ \$3.75	\$ 60.
Overhead 16 hrs @ \$3.50	56.
Subcontract - H. O. Boehme	<u>2,100.</u>
Total Prime Costs	\$2,216
Administration @ 10%	<u>222.</u>
Profit @ 12%	<u>293.</u>
Reimbursement requested	\$2,731.

— Duplication ?

Item 28-a

The control was returned and again placed in operation January 17, 1956.

Since this control was damaged in use, we request that a separate purchase order be issued in the amount of \$2,731. to cover the repair of this unit.

Sincerely yours,

THE PERKIN-ELMER CORPORATION

25X1

RMS/dmg

SABO 3651/a
COPY 101

P R O P O S A L

Drift Sight and Hand Control

January 23, 1956

DRIFT SIGHT AND HAND CONTROL

At the time of the first flights with the prototype drift sight, September 20, 21, it was discovered that enough change in the seat, seat pack and other arrangements had taken place to require a re-location of the eye point of the sight. A temporary lens was made and attached to move the eyepoint forward but it still had to be moved upward about two inches. This required a redesign of the head of the sight. We feel that the costs of this redesign and reconstruction of the head already built at the time of the change, should be recognized in a contract change.

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Contract Price</u>
Design of new head	\$ 2,000.	\$ 2,530.
Replacement of optics and mechanical parts in three heads completed before September 20.	2,100.	2,660.
Replacement of parts not usable in new design	<u>3,612.</u>	<u>4,570.</u>
Total change due to redesign	\$ 7,712.	\$ 9,760.

We suggest that the contract be amended as follows:

Item 30-A To replace Item 30 and to read:

Construct, test and deliver ten (10) Scanning Periscopes each containing the simplified version of the hand control unit but modified, if necessary, as indicated by the results of the prototype tests. \$17,455.40 \$174,554.

This is an increase of \$9,760.

As an alternative, a simple purchase order from you could cover the price of \$9,760. without amendment to the contract.

Item 30 - (164,794.)
 Item 30A - 174,554.
 9,760.-

January 23, 1956

Cost 8715
 Profit 1045
 9760

REC 3651/B
JAN 1 1956

P R O P O S A L

24" f/8 - New Design

January 23, 1956

THE 24" f/8 LENS

According to the Statement of Work by [] of January 14, 1955, and subsequent description by [], January 21, 1955, the Perkin-Elmer Corporation was to rework a number of 24" f/6.3 lenses for use in modified K38 cameras. These lenses were to be replaced by new lenses which were to be designed to give improved resolution than possible with the available lenses.

25X1
25X1

[] supplied a new design on February 19, 1955. Glass to make a prototype and 40 complete lenses was ordered, and the first set delivered about June 1. There was a short delay occasioned by a change of glass type due to the unavailability of a type originally specified.

25X1

The prototype was constructed during June and July, and work was started on 17 sets of glass. It would have been our normal procedure to delay start of work on the glass until after the analysis of the performance of the prototype, but about three months could have been saved, if the prototype proved good, by starting on some production glass at once.

Tests of the prototype proved disappointing so work was stopped until a new design could be worked out. This decision was made by [] and others, with our concurrence, on September 12.

25X1

On November 3, 1955, a new design, using the same glass types, was provided by []. This design could be made from the blanks on hand, but the pieces already worked for the first design could not be reworked for the new one. In addition, the new design requires a more strongly curved platen than is now used in the K38 cameras.

25X1

The second prototype has been completed and tested. It proves to be a very much better lens than its predecessor and is now, January 10, 1956, on its way to be flight tested.

As a result of this redirection of the program brought about by the change to a new design, the following changes in cost are anticipated. We request that our Contract SC-21-54 be amended to show the recommended changes.

Our suggestion:

- 1) Under present contract
 - a) test prototype
 - b) start work on 5 more
- 2) When test on prototype is available for study, if good, make decision to:
 - a) go ahead with 24 more
 - b) order glass to make the rest (11)
 - c) Amend contract for price of \$133,799 (increase in price of \$23,891., increase of \$109,877 in costs). Get all papers worked up before February 1, 1956.
 - d) when glass comes, finish up the total of 40.

- Item 38-A Provide the necessary engineering services to redesign the 24" f/8 lens in accordance with the new design furnished by the Projector Division on November 15, 1955 and furnish one copy of the final design to the Government. \$ 942.
- Delivery - January 1, 1956
- Item 39-A Construct, test and deliver a prototype of the 24" f/8 lens redesigned under Item 38-A. \$ 6,416.
- Delivery - January 16, 1956
- Item 40-A Purchase the required quantities of LaK-9 and KzFS-4 optical glass including a sufficient overage of each type of glass to provide for breakage and damage to manufacture the eleven (11) 24" f/8 lenses under Item 41-C. \$ 22,553.
- Delivery - Six weeks from date of order
- Item 41-A Construct, test and deliver five (5) 24" f/8 lenses in shipping barrels similar to the prototype developed under Item 38-A but modified, if necessary, as indicated by the results of the prototype tests. \$1,027.60 \$ 5,138.
- Delivery - April 1, 1956
- Item 41-B Construct, test and deliver twenty-four (24) 24" f/8 lenses in shipping barrels in addition to the lenses being supplied under Item 41-A. \$ 572.79 \$ 13,747.
- Delivery - June 1, 1956
- Item 41-C Construct, test and deliver eleven (11) 24" f/8 lenses in shipping barrels in addition to the lenses being supplied under Items 41-A and 41-B. \$ 706.82 \$ 7,775.
- Delivery - 3 months from receipt of glass

New target costs of
Items 38, 38a, 39 39a,
40, 40a, 41a, 41b, 41c, 42

\$ 105,720

Old target costs of
Items 38, 39, 40, 41, 42

86,843

Difference

\$ 18,877

G&A @ 13%

2,454
\$ 21,331

Profit @ 12%

2,560
\$ 23,891

Price of Items delivered plus new
Items 38,38a, 39, 39a, 40, 40a, 41a,
41b, 41c, 42

\$133,799

Price of Items 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
(per present contract)

109,908

Increase in price requested

\$ 23,891 ✓

Items already delivered

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Estimated Cost</u>
38	Design	\$ 4,899
39	First prototype	6,598
40	Glass	<u>49,107</u>
		\$60,604

Costs to 10-31-55 when work
was stopped

55,301

Savings in costs realized on
items 38, 39,40.

\$ 5,303

January 23, 1956

SAPC 3651/c
COPY 1 OF 1

P R O P O S A L

36" f/10 Lens

January 23, 1956

36" f/10 Lens

On September 12, 1955 [] examined the results of tests on the 36" f/10 prototype lens for "B" camera. While it appeared that the construction of the lens was in accordance with the design, the performance was not satisfactory. [] then undertook a redesign of the lens. The design has been completed and a new prototype constructed. The performance is very much improved, and it is felt to be completely satisfactory. The design is of such form that no new glass will be required. Some parts for all lenses had been fabricated before the design change. These will be now obsoleted and replaced.

25X1

25X1

We request that our contract be amended as follows:

Item 21 has been invoiced and paid for.

Item 21-A is here added to cover our design costs for the new optical design.

Item 22-A is a prototype of the new design in addition to the one of old design already constructed and delivered under Item 22.

Item 24-A replaces Item 24 which is to be deleted and covers five lenses of the new design.

Item 24-B covers the costs of those parts already manufactured for use in Item 24 now deleted.

The deletion of Item 24 and addition of Items 21-A, 22-A, 24-A and 24-B provide a net increase in contract price of \$11,516.

Cost # 10,282
Profit # 1,234
Total # 11,516

January 23, 1956

36" f/10 lens

Item 21-A	Provide the necessary engineering services to redesign the 36" f/10 lens in accordance with the new design furnished by the Projector Division on November 1, 1955, and furnish one copy of the final design to the Government.	\$ 1,055
	Delivery - January 15, 1956	
Item 22-A	Construct, test and deliver a prototype of the 36" f/10 lens redesigned under Item 21-A	\$ 7,442
	Delivery - February 1, 1956	
Item 24-A	Construct, test and deliver five (5) 36" f/10 lenses similar to the prototype developed under Item 22-A but modified, if necessary, as indicated by the results of the prototype tests.	\$ 3,939 \$ 19,695
	Delivery - One (1) March 1, 1956 One(1) April 1, 1956 One (1) May 1, 1956 Two (2) June 1, 1956	
Item 24-B	Cost of tools, materials and parts obsoleted by the redesign of the 36" f/10 lens	\$ <u>4,425</u>
		\$ 32,617

January 23, 1956

3651/0
1 0 2

P R O P O S A L

Long Focal Length System "C"

January 23, 1956

LONG FOCAL LENGTH SYSTEM "C"

On September 12 a review of progress on "C" indicated that we could better accomplish our objective of 120" focal length with a simpler system than the one which was then being designed.

On October 1 a meeting of the committee concluded that a return to at least 180" focal length was required. [] then undertook to provide such a design. In the meantime, all other work on the system dependent on the optical design was halted. Work on other parts proceeded, however, so that a minimum of time would be lost. The new design has been completed and we feel that an increase in the consulting fee to Spica Corporation to cover the additional work resulting from the need for this new design is justified.

25X1

Spica Corporation has requested an amendment to their contract in the amount of \$11,400. As the time has already been expended, this amount is supported by the costs incurred.

We, therefore, request that Item 20 be amended to provide a new price of \$76,442. The effect of the new design on the costs of the rest of the camera is now being estimated and will be available shortly.

Handwritten calculations and a signature:

$$\begin{array}{r} 11,400 \\ 342,000 \\ \hline 1,482,000 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 11,400 \\ 1482 \\ \hline 1288 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 14,426 \\ 12,842 \\ \hline 1,546 \end{array}$$

Ref

Item 20

January 23, 1956

Item 20 - Purchase the services of [redacted] and Spica, Inc.
as consultants in the field of system engineering and
optical design of the specific equipment required for
the satisfactory performance of the program.

25X1

\$76,442

Delivery - To be billed monthly

January 23, 1956